

-8-

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated April 30, 2004. In the Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1-6 and 8-11 are amended, claim 7 is canceled and claims 12-14 are added. A Petition to Revive is also filed along with this Amendment.

Claims 4 and 11 were objected to because claims 4 and 11 include the word "WHEREBY" in all capital letters. This language has been deleted in both claims 4 and 11. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 4 and 11 can be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said program window". This language has been deleted. It is respectfully submitted that the § 112 rejection to claim 3 can be withdrawn.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Deo (US 5,720,033). Claims 1-6 and 8-11 have been amended and claim 7 has been canceled. It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest all of the claim elements of independent claims 1 and 5.

In regards to independent claim 1, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest "accessing the plurality of user interface elements, wherein some of the user interface elements include a set of modifiable access properties that indicate a level of access needed to access that user interface element", "establishing an access profile for each user of the point-of-sale system, the access profile indicates the level of access of user interface elements that each user is allowed to access" and "controlling each user interface element displayed on the point-of-sale system during a normal mode of operation by comparing the level of access indicated in the access profile of a user of the point-of-sale system with the level of access of each user interface element that is to be displayed."

The Deo reference discloses assigning user access types, such as "All-but-Delete", "uCanRead", "uCanWrite", "uCanUpdate" and "uCanProcess", to limit operations that a user can perform on an application. See col. 4, lines 51-65 and col. 6, line 60 through col. 7, line 13.

-9-

Although a user's access is limited by defined access types in Deo, Deo fails to teach or suggest the method of controlling access as is claimed in claim 1. First, Deo fails to teach accessing user interface elements that include access properties that indicate a level of access needed to access that particular user interface element. Second, Deo fails to teach establishing an access profile for each user that indicates the level of access each user is allowed. Lastly, Deo fails to teach comparing the level of access indicated in the access profile of a user of the point-of-sale system with the level of access of each user interface element that is to be displayed.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 2-4 are also in condition for allowance as depending on allowable base claim 1. However, claims 2-4 are also in condition for allowance for other reasons. For example, Deo fails to teach or suggest displaying only those user interface elements that have access property levels equal to or less than the level of access indicated in the access profile of the user as claimed in claim 3. Deo also fails to teach or suggest user interface elements whose levels of access properties are greater than the levels of access indicated in the access profile of the user as claimed in claim 4.

In regards to independent claim 5, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest "an access management module configured to allow an authorized administrator to set up access levels for user interface elements of the point-of-sale system", "an access control table configured to store access profiles for each user of the point-of-sale system as set up by the authorized administrator, each access profile indicates the level of access of user interface elements that each user is allowed to access" and "a display management module configured to instruct the point-of-sale system which user interface elements should be rendered by comparing the access levels of each user interface element to the access profile of a user".

The Deo reference discloses access types, rules that are relevant to each access type and a library that manages and maintains the rules. See FIG. 1 and col. 6, line 25 through col. 8, line 51. Although a user's access is limited by defined access types in Deo, Deo fails to teach or suggest a system as claimed in claim 5. First, Deo fails to teach an access management module that allows an authorized administrator to set up access levels for user interface elements.

-10-

Second, Deo fails to teach an access control table that stores access profiles for each user and indicates the level of access of user interface elements that each user is allowed to access. Lastly, Deo fails to teach a display management module that instructs the point-of-sale system what user interface elements should be rendered by comparing access levels of user interface elements that were set up in the access management module to the access profile of a user that is stored in the access control table.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 6 and 8-11 are also in condition for allowance as depending on allowable base claim 5. However, claims 6 and 8-11 are in condition for allowance for other reasons. For example, Deo fails to teach or suggest the display management module displaying only those user interface elements that have access levels equal to or less than the level of access indicated in the access profile of the user as claimed in claim 10. Deo also fails to teach or suggest the display management module hiding user interface elements that have access levels that are greater than the levels of access indicated in the access profile of the user as claimed in claim 11.

New claims 12-14 have been added. Claims 12-14 are also allowable over the cited reference as depending on allowable base claim 1. However, claims 12-14 are allowable for other reasons. For example, the cited reference fails to teach or suggest accessing user interface elements that are highlighted as claimed in claim 12. The cited reference fails to teach or suggest access properties including a form name, a control name, a form class and an access level as claimed in claim 13. The cited reference also fails to teach or suggest a disable read button and a disable change button for the access level of a select user interface element as claimed in claim 14.

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that in light of the above remarks, claims 1-6 and 8-11 are patentable over the cited references. In addition, new claims 12-14 are believed to be allowable over the cited references as well. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-14 are respectfully requested.


-11-

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:

  
Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 58,675  
Suite 1400 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244  
Phone: (612) 334-3222  
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jme